

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/611,341	07/02/2003	Takeshi Momochi	06761.0054	3810
22852 75	590 11/28/2005		EXAMINER	
	HENDERSON, FARAI	ROSS, DANA		
LLP 901 NEW YOR	K AVENUE, NW	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			3722	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TUK

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/611,341	MOMOCHI ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Dana Ross	3722			
The MAIL Period for Reply	ING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHICHEVER IS - Extensions of time n after SIX (6) MONTH - If NO period for reply - Failure to reply within Any reply received b	STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE and be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 for from the mailing date of this communication. It is specified above, the maximum statutory period we in the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, by the Office later than three months after the mailing adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Responsiv	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 November 2005</u> .					
2a)⊠ This action	☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.					
•	-,— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
closed in a	accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Clai	ms					
4a) Of the 5) ☐ Claim(s) _ 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>7</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) _	 -20 is/are pending in the application. above claim(s) is/are withdrav is/are allowed. -20 is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers						
10)⊠ The drawir Applicant n Replaceme	cation is objected to by the Examine ag(s) filed on <u>02 July 2003</u> is/are: a)[and not request that any objection to the onto the description of the correction of the correcti	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See to it required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U	.S.C. § 119					
a)⊠ All b)[1.⊠ Cer 2.□ Cer 3.□ Cop app	gment is made of a claim for foreign Some * c) None of: tified copies of the priority documents tified copies of the priority documents ies of the certified copies of the prioritication from the International Bureau ached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
	son's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) sure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 120/103

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US Pat. No. 6,030,326 (Azuma et al., hereafter '326).

'326 teaches an automatic tool change system which includes the method of positioning a spindle 11 relative to a nut tightening and nut loosening station for removal of a tool and replacement with a new tool (see col. 10 line 25 – col. 11, line 15, for example); a gear box 43 with a plurality of attachment and detachment members 41, 41', 42, 42' (see col. 5, lines 7-17, for example); gear box 43 is aligned with a tool (see reference numbers 17 and 18 of figure 2) in the spindle, a nut 108 which holds the tool (see figure 7), and rotary head 146 which removes and tightens the nut 108 for replacement of the tool (see col. 10, lines 27-41, for example); a auxiliary stopper 31 for preventing rotation of the spindle by engaging hub 18 during rotation of the nut (see figures 3A, 3B and col. 4, lines 41-58, for example); a motor 46 which rotates the attachment and detachment members 41, 42 (see col. 5, lines 35-46, for example).

4. Claims 7, 12-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under US Pat. No. 5,382,213 (Kopel et al., hereafter '213).

'213 teaches an automatic tool change system which includes the method of positioning a spindle relative to a nut tightening and nut loosening station for removal of a tool and replacement with a new tool (see abstract and figure 4, for example). It is noted that the spindle is positioned near the nut loosening and tightening station (nut loosening station becomes the nut tightening station after the nut has been loosened) with the nut loosening and tightening drivers being the spindle drivers that control the direction of the spindle rotation.

Though '213 teaches rotating the spindle relative to the nut, it is inherent that the nut is likewise, in relation, rotated relative to the spindle. In the alternative, if Applicant does not agree that the "relative" motion between the nut and spindle is such that the nut moves relative to the spindle, it is noted that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to rotate the jig such that the nut was rotated while the spindle was stationary since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. In this instance, the nut is rotated relative to the spindle through the rotation of the spindle. It would have been obvious to have the nut rotated relative to the spindle through rotation of the nut.

5. Regarding the above rejections under '326 and '213, in the alternative, in the event that Applicant does not agree that the nut loosening station becomes the nut tightening station after the nut has been loosed, it is noted that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a second tool change system and instead of having one unitary unit, to have a duplicate tool change system and perform only one action

Art Unit: 3722

with each unit since mere duplication of a tool involves only routine skill in the art. Furthermore, though '326 or '213 do not expressly disclose the use of two separate and distinct stations, the purpose of the station with two functions is to loosen and tighten the spindle tool holding nut. The tightening and loosing a nut for tool replacement is notoriously well known in the machine tool art for the purpose of replacing a tool as is taught by '326 and '213. Applicant's claim language is a functional equivalents to '326 and '213's nut tightening and loosening station, and as such, it would be obvious, absent a statement of criticality, to substitute one known functional equivalent for another, depending for example on the availability of components at the time of assembly. Therefore since the need for the two actions (nut tightening and nut loosening) are needed for both tightening and loosening a nut and '326 and '213 teach the station in two modes to perform the tightening and loosening, the method of loosening and tightening a nut as taught by '326, '213 and Applicant were art-recognized equivalents at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute the two actions with one station and use two stations for the nut loosening and removal.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant has cancelled all previous claims and added new claims 7-20.

In an attempt to expedite prosecution, Examiner notes the broad terminology used, especially in regard to the independent claims. Examiner recommends claiming the details of Applicant's invention in accordance with the disclosed embodiment of figure 2. As currently claimed, Examiner finds the broad claim language of the independent claims to read on a manual

Art Unit: 3722

process of using a wrench, by hand, to loosen a nut to replace a tool and then tightening the nut for use of a new tool.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dana Ross whose telephone number is 571-272-4480. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/611,341

Art Unit: 3722

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dmr

BOYER D. ASHLEY PRIMARY EXAMINER